



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/670,934

09/25/2003

James S. Voss

200208330-1

2046

22879 7590 05/03/2007

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

SHIBRU, HELEN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2621

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/03/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/670,934	VOSS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	HELEN SHIBRU	2621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Syeda-Mahmood (US Pat. No. 6,578,040).

Regarding claim 1, Syeda-Mahmood discloses a method for locating a video file, the method comprising: identifying a key image (see fig. 3 step 30, where electronic slide image are identified); identifying a plurality of video files (see fig. 3 step 30 where video images are identified); and searching the plurality of video files for a match with the key image using an image comparison technology (see abstract, and fig. 3 step 35, where the slide image is matched with the geometric keyframe. See also col. 9 lines 8-20).

Regarding claim 2, Syeda-Mahmood discloses the key image is contained in a still image file (see fig. 1 slides 12 and col. 5 lines 15-31).

Regarding claim 3, Syeda-Mahmood discloses identifying a key image comprises identifying at least one of an identity of the still image file and a location of the still image file (see step 32 in fig. 3 where it shows that the slide images are identified. See also abstract).

Regarding claim 4, Syeda-Mahmood discloses the key image was not originally extracted from any of the plurality of video files (see claim 1 and the abstract, the electronic slide image are derived from the first media type).

Note to the Applicant: The USPTO considers the Applicant's "at least one" language to be anticipated by any reference containing one of the subsequent corresponding elements

Regarding claim 5, Syeda-Mahmood discloses searching the plurality of video files comprises searching at least one multi-mode image file that comprises low-resolution images and at least one high-resolution image (see col. 6 lines 23-36).

Regarding claim 6, Syeda-Mahmood discloses identifying a plurality of video files comprises identifying at least one of an identity of the plurality of video files and a location of a plurality of video files (see col. 7 lines 10-61).

Regarding claim 7, Syeda-Mahmood discloses searching comprises executing a pattern matching algorithm (see fig. 5 and col. 6 lines 53-65).

Regarding claim 8, Syeda-Mahmood discloses searching comprises executing at least one of a normalization algorithm, a correlation algorithm, a geometric pattern matching algorithm, and a least squares fit algorithm (see col. 7 lines 45-col. 8 line 4).

Regarding claim 9, Syeda-Mahmood discloses identifying a located video file that is a match for the key image to a user (see col. 7 lines 49-62).

Regarding claim 10, Syeda-Mahmood discloses identifying at least one timestamp within a video file that indicates a match (see col. 4 lines 39-45 and col. 5 lines 16-26).

Regarding claim 11, the limitation of claim 11 is found in claim 1 above. Therefore claim 11 is analyzed and rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 1 above.

Claims 12-13 are rejected for the same reason as discussed in claims 5 and 7 respectively above.

Regarding claim 14, Syeda-Mahmood discloses identifying a video file that was determined to contain image content that is contained within the key image (see fig. 3 where it shows the video file contained images).

Regarding claim 15, the limitation of claim 15 is found in claim 1 above. Therefore claim 15 is analyzed and rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 1 above.

Claim 16 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 8 above.

Regarding claim 17, Syeda-Mahmood discloses the logic configured to compare is configured to compare the key image to at least one high-resolution image of the multi-mode image file (see col. 6 lines 23-36).

Claim 18 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 9 above.

Regarding claim 19, Syeda-Mahmood discloses logic configured to identify at least one timestamp within the located video file, the at least one timestamp indicating a frame within the video file that matches the key image (see col. 4 lines 39-45 and col. 5 lines 16-26).

Regarding claim 20, the limitation of claim 20 is found in claim 1 above. Therefore claim 20 is analyzed and rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 1 above.

Regarding claim 21, Syeda-Mahmood discloses identify an image comprises logic configured to receive a user's selection of an image being shown to the user (see col. 7 lines 45-62).

Regarding claim 22, Syeda-Mahmood discloses the logic configured to identify a group of video files comprises logic configured to receive a user's selection of the group of video files (see col. 7 lines 49-62).

Regarding claim 23, Syeda-Mahmood discloses the logic configured to receive a user's selection of the group of video files comprises logic configured to receive the user's selection of a directory containing a plurality of video files (see fig. 6 and col. 8 lines 61-67).

Claim 24 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 5 above.

Regarding claim 25, Syeda-Mahmood discloses the logic configured to search comprises logic to identify at least one video frame of at least one video file that matches the key image (see fig. 3).

Regarding claim 26, Syeda-Mahmood discloses the logic configured to search comprises logic to only search high-resolution images embedded within the stored video files to identify at least one high-resolution image that matches the key image (see col. 6 lines 24-36).

Regarding claim 27, Syeda-Mahmood discloses the logic configured to search comprises logic to identify a feature contained within the key image that is also contained in at least one video frame of at least one video file (see fig. 3).

Conclusion

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HELEN SHIBRU whose telephone number is (571) 272-7329. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, THAI Q. TRAN can be reached on (571) 272-7382. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Helen Shibru
April 25, 2007


THAI O. TRAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600